

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-21 and 23 remain active in this case, and are amended herewith. Claims 1-10 and 22 are canceled by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-5 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Tiller (U.S. Patent 6,529,721). Claims 11, 12, 14, 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Yan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,819,914, hereinafter called "Yan"). Claims 2, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tiller in view of Long (U.S. Patent 6,026,286). Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tiller. Claims 13 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yan in view of Long. However, Claim 16 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise indicated as including allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that Claim 16 includes allowable subject matter. However, since Applicant considers that amended Claim 11 patentably defines over the art of record, Claim 16 has presently been maintained in dependent form.


In response to the several grounds for rejection on the merits, and to expedite issuance of a patent from the present application, Claims 1-10 have been canceled and the remaining claims amended to clarify what are believed to be patentably distinguishing differences of Applicants' invention. The amended Claims are believed to find support in the original claims and in the disclosure as originally filed, and no new matter has been added.

As stated in the amended independent claims, the double balanced mixture according to the present invention comprises two differential transistor pairs connecting separate inductors (42, 52 of Figure 8). In contrast, the inductor of each of the cited references is provided as a transformer, constituted by a primary coil and a secondary coil between two differential transistor pairs. Thus, it is clear that the double balance mixture according to the Applicant's claimed invention does not constitute a transformer, and Claims 11-21 and 23, which have been amended to emphasize this distinction, are believed to be clearly patentably distinguishing over the art of record.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)